

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION / MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. One		3. EFFECTIVE DATE		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	
6. ISSUED BY Contracts Office USAID Ethiopia 2030 Addis Ababa Place Washington, D.C. 20521-2030		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP code) TO ALL OFFERORS/BIDDERS		<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. 663-02-002 <input type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 12/03/2001 <input type="checkbox"/> 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. <input type="checkbox"/> 10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)			
CODE		FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> is extended <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
<input type="checkbox"/> A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify Authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.					
<input type="checkbox"/> B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY					
<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:					
<input type="checkbox"/> D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible)					
The purpose of this modification is to extend the closing date of the solicitation to February 15, 2002, provide additional information to offerors and answer questions asked by offerors. The RFP is specifically modified as follows:					
1. Cover Letter, Due date/time: delete "January 15, 2002, 5:00 p.m. local time" and substitute "February 15, 2002, 11:00 a.m. local time".					
2. Section H: - Page H-1, delete "Senior Research Agronomist" and insert "Senior Research Advisor" in lieu thereof. - Page H-2, Local-hire support personnel, delete "13 persons" and replace with "11 persons".					
3. See Attachment for answers to questions regarding the solicitation.					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.					
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16A NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
(Signature of person authorized to sign)				16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
				16C. DATE SIGNED	
				(Signature of person authorized to sign)	

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS REGARDING THE SOLICITATION

QUESTION 1. Are there particular implications you can alert us to regarding the fact that the #663-02-002 Ethiopia Ag RFP is being offered as an RFP as opposed to an RFA?

ANSWER 1. There are no particular implications. RFP is more appropriate to the work to be performed and the control the Mission/Host Government wish to retain.

QUESTION 2. What flexibility will there be in subcontracting? For example, while the RFP specifically mentions that subcontracting can occur with Part 2 (microenterprise development), it does not mention Part 1. Does this mean that it is suggested or required for Part 2 and excluded for Part 1? Or can the Contractor subcontract wherever it deems it best for the performance of services in both Parts 1 and 2?

ANSWER 2. It is not anticipated that one organization would have all the capacity required. Therefore, the contractor can determine when subcontracts are needed and where it deems it best for the performance of services in both Parts 1 and 2.

QUESTION 3. In Section C, Part A, you state that "Classroom training will be conducted in Ethiopia, with degrees jointly awarded by collaborating US and Ethiopian universities". This is repeated again in Part B.1.c. However, in Part D.1 (Degree Training) you imply that a much more flexible partnership between US and Ethiopian institutions is being sought for the degree training program. Please clarify.

ANSWER 3. Since Section C, Parts A and B use the word "will", this section should govern.

QUESTION 4. Virtually all Title XII universities have rigorous residency requirements that would preclude granting a US degree without study in the US. Furthermore, the granting of "joint" degrees from both institutions is problematic. As a general rule, even when a program of study is jointly offered by two collaborating institutions, the student's degree is from one institution or the other - not both. Consequently, we hope you are looking for the more flexible partnership implied in Part D.1.

ANSWER 4. Yes, we are looking for the more flexible partnership implied in Part D.1.

QUESTION 5. i) No point value is given for the Cost Proposal. Please clarify.

ii) Page M-1: Cost Evaluation - M.1.b. states that the method of scoring of cost proposal is described in this section. It appears to have been omitted. Please provide clarification on the weight given to costs. Is it 20 points out of 100?

ANSWER 5. As stated in page M-3, Section M.1 (7) all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

QUESTION 6. Is the length of the contract 60 or 66 months? Both are mentioned.

ANSWER 6. The overall contract is for 66 months, Part one is for 66 months and Part two is for 54 months.

QUESTION 7. Is it possible for a large, for-profit consulting firm to be a subcontractor in either Part 2 or Part 1 of the contract?

ANSWER 7. Yes.

QUESTION 8. In the RFP, it is stated in bold print that funds for the project are not currently available. Are they in the pipeline somewhere? When is it anticipated that funding will be available so that an award can be made?

ANSWER 8. By the end of January 2002.

QUESTION 9. Is there any expectation about the mix of expatriates and Ethiopians in the long-term senior staff? Or will the staffing be left up to the Contractor?

ANSWER 9. The staffing will be left up to the offeror within the qualification guidelines of the RFP.

QUESTION 10. Will the mission specify either: a) an overall level of effort; or b) results that the contractor must achieve during the LOP so that the scope of the contract can be better determined?

ANSWER 10. No.

QUESTION 11. Will the Contractor be able to propose different levels of effort for each position or should it adhere to the LOE mentioned in the RFP?

ANSWER 11. The contractor can propose options, though the long-term expatriate is pretty much fixed.

QUESTION 12. Does the Chief of Party have to come from one of the already identified positions or can the Contractor propose an alternative staffing chart in which there is a COP that does not come from the positions already identified?

ANSWER 12. Yes, the contractor can propose an alternative staffing chart in which there is a COP that does not come from the positions already identified.

QUESTION 13. To what extent, if any, will specific experience in Ethiopia, as opposed to experience with similar research and extension issues, be considered in the evaluation?

ANSWER 13. Criteria 4.a. states "experience relevant" to Ethiopia and does not require "experience in Ethiopia".

QUESTION 14. There is no mention in Section L about the length of term for the Microenterprise Development Specialist. What is the time period expected?

ANSWER 14. 48 months.

QUESTION 15. Will fees be allowed for subcontracts? The RFP states that it is a No Fee contract but under cooperative agreements, subcontractors are typically allowed to charge a fee.

ANSWER 15. See Questions and Answers No. 17. The resulting award document WILL NOT BE A Cooperative Agreement.

QUESTION 16. Could a contractor submit a proposal using a subcontractor, with them providing one or two positions such as the agronomist or watershed management person? The language in the RFP on page L-4 makes me think this might not be possible, but I would like clarification from you.

ANSWER 16. Yes, a contractor can submit a proposal using a subcontractor, with them providing one or two positions such as the agronomist or watershed management person.

QUESTION 17. Is there a possibility of participation on non-Title XII entities as subcontractors, and if so, whether a for-profit subcontractor to a Title XII proposer would be allowed to charge a fee?

ANSWER 17. Subcontractors are authorized. If a subcontractor is a profit making concern, profit or fee would be an allowable charge.

QUESTION 18. Is a subcontracting plan required to be submitted with the proposal and can we calculate a daily rate by taking an annual salary and dividing it by 2080 and multiplying by 8. Is that a problem?

ANSWER 18. This methodology is acceptable if it is a normal method of calculation for the organization.

QUESTION 19. What is the estimated USD amount of funds available for this RFP?

ANSWER 19. We are not disclosing estimated value of the contract.

QUESTION 20. Section H.3 ©, Level of Effort - The illustrative list of positions shows 30 person months of Short-Term Technical Assistance. Does this cover both parts 1 and 2 of the RFP? If this is a total for both, please provide the estimated person month breakdown for each part.

ANSWER 20. This covers only part 1 of the RFP. Part 2 is to be proposed by the contractor.

QUESTION 21. Section M.1 (5), Evaluation Criteria-Qualifications, Relevant Experience, and Availability of Personnel - This section indicates that a maximum of 25 points will be scored for this section. Can you please provide a breakdown of the maximum number of points for each of the three parts: Long-Term Personnel, Short-Term International Personnel and Local Personnel?

ANSWER 21. No - other than the priority will be given in descending order.

QUESTION 22. Page C-2, C-3: The RFP describes the role and authorities of the FSPCO and BOA in the project. The RFP also identifies ARARI, ACSI, REMSEDA and DPPB, but their roles and authorities with respect to the project are not given. Please provide information on the project-related roles and responsibilities of these agencies.

ANSWER 23. In addition to the description of the role and responsibilities of the FSPCO and the BoA in implementing the RHPP SO, the following information is provided with regard to other counterparts:

ARARI, working in coordination with the FSPCO, has the principal technical leadership and management role for carrying out the USAID-supported adaptive research activities in the region, as further described in the Part 1 of the Scope of Work (SOW).

ACSI is the largest MFI in the ANRS, and will be the principal beneficiary of USAID-supported micro-finance activities as further described in Part 2 of the Scope of Work (SOW).

REMSEDA, working in coordination with the FSPCO, has the principal technical leadership role for coordinating USAID-supported micro-finance and micro-enterprise development activities as further described in Part 2 of the Scope of Work (SOW).

DPPB has the principal oversight role for Private Voluntary Organizations operating in the ANRS, and will be a principal partner in the R2D activity.

QUESTION 23. Page C-8: The RFP states that the project will be a long-term partner of EARO on certain policy matters. Please clarify the role and authority of EARO in the project itself.

ANSWER 23. The role of EARO is defined by its relationship with ARARI. It has no direct implementation or management role in the RHPP SO. It is only within the context of EARO's role as a coordinator/advisor on agricultural research throughout Ethiopia that the Contractor is expected to be a long-term partner with EARO.

QUESTION 24. Page C-8: Please clarify what is meant by the statement that the Contractor will "provide financial... support" in carrying out the household-level demand driven research activities.

ANSWER 24. Contractor provision of financial and operational support for carrying out household-level, demand-driven research activities is limited to the costs of short-term technical assistance and training provided within the bounds of the contract as agreed upon in the Annual Work Plan.

QUESTION 25. Page C-9: Modernization of Research Labs - Will there be a budget included in this contract for this equipment? If so, please indicate an amount that should be budgeted for this.

ANSWER 25. The contract does not include a budget for research lab equipment. The Contractor is expected to help ARARI define priority research lab equipment needs required to support implementation. All research lab equipment will be directly procured by USAID.

QUESTION 26. Page C-9: Increased Research Efficiency - Do all potential university partners offer MS and PhD degree programs? Also, please provide information on the extent, operation and reliability of Internet access at potential university partners.

ANSWER 26. We expect offerors to determine for themselves the extent to which universities in Ethiopia offer, or are capable of offering, MS- and PhD-level training with support provided under the contract.

QUESTION 27. Pages C-12, C-13, C-18: Title II Cooperating Sponsors - There is some description of the Title II Cooperating Sponsors (CS) operation in the RFP, but also mention of the need for the Contractor to facilitate and assist the players in this program. Please provide additional information on the nature of the existing and proposed operations to be facilitated by the Contractor, so that we may address this in our proposal. Are Title II CS currently building the capacities of local MFI? Can CS join teams which bid on this project, or will the DevA grants put them into a "conflict of interest" situation?

ANSWER 27. Title II Cooperating Sponsors are currently developing proposals for the CY 2003-2007 DAP cycle. Awards will be made based on competitive review of those proposals. Title II funding will be complemented by USAID/Ethiopia bilateral funding in amounts as yet undetermined. All applicants have been advised that proposals are expected to support achievement of the Mission's strategic objectives. The Contractor, in support of the ANRS regional food security program, is expected to assist in coordinating and supporting future Title II CS activities in the region consistent with and contribution to the RHPP SO.

QUESTION 28. Page C-12: Strengthening Community Level Management - The RFP indicates that local

TA will be provided through the Cooperative Promotion Bureau (CPB). Will the local TA be employed by the project, or will they be employees of the CPB? What is the role and authority of the CPB in the project?

ANSWER 28. Technical assistance provided through the Cooperative Promotion Bureau (CPB) is not part of this contract. The CPB is responsible for supporting the reorganization and re-registration of cooperatives, and promoting the formation of new cooperative organizations. The CPB is also responsible for auditing cooperative operations. Technical assistance to the CPB is currently provided under a Cooperative Agreement with ACDI/VOCA. USAID also plans to provide direct financial assistance to the CPB to support and expand its operations in support of RHPP SO implementation

QUESTION 29. Page C-16: Micro Enterprise Development activities will be an important resource for several project components. Could you please clarify the rationale behind not including MED activities in the watershed sites?

ANSWER 29. As stated in the SOW, the four pilot micro-catchment sites have been selected as learning centers where pilot community motivational activities will be identified and implemented. These activities may include such things as development of potable water points, technology demonstrations, and water retention systems. While USAID/Ethiopia and the ANRS recognize that micro-enterprise activities may need to be incorporated into this approach, at this time the concentration is on promoting participatory, community approaches to micro-catchment management as a means of improving land use.

QUESTION 30. Page C-17: It is not clear from the RFP whether the training, specialized short courses and study tours for MFI staff will be paid for by the project, or by the MFI. Would you please clarify who will pay for these trainings? And if the project, can you provide a plug figure to be included in the cost proposal?

ANSWER 30. As stated in the Section C.IV, the Contractor is expected to develop, pilot test and implement a training program to upgrade the skill level of micro-finance practitioners in order to achieve the results specified in Section E. We expect offers to include a description of the approach to be used, and the expected cost, of achieving those results.

QUESTION 31. Page C-23: Local L-T Personnel - This page stipulates that there will be "up to 11". However, on page H-2, the number 13 is mentioned. Please indicate the correct number.

ANSWER 31. The figure of up to 11 local long-term personnel to be provided under Part 1 of the Contract as shown on page C-23 is correct. The figure shown on Page H-2 should also be 11, not 13 (changed through this modification).

QUESTION 32. H-1, H-2: Level of Effort - The Home Office Research/Extension Mentor is mentioned here, but not in other sections of the RFP. Please clarify.

ANSWER 32. In the context of the instructions provided with regard to long-term training for research and extension staff, USAID/Ethiopia anticipated the involvement of academic advisors/mentors for BSc, MSc and (possibly) PhD students during their senior projects (BSc) and thesis research (MSc/PhD). The Home Office Research/Extension Mentor was included in anticipation of the need to supervise and coordinate this process. However, offerors are welcome to propose alternatives to this position.

QUESTION 33. Page C-20: The Sr. Research Advisor position is the only one of the 4 expatriate long-term positions indicated for a 5-year duration. This person's technical advisor responsibilities related to research management and coordination are already considerable and complex. Assuming that the role of Chief of Party should remain in country for the entire length of the program, these additional management

responsibilities would be so significant that there is risk that neither role would be carried out effectively. However, bidders are encouraged to identify any one of the 4 L-T positions as COP and justify the designation. What flexibility exists to increase the LOE of another position to accommodate this?

ANSWER 33. The functions of COP are listed separately so that offerors may designate the most appropriate individual(s) to carry out these functions. There is no requirement that the COP be the same individual throughout the life of the contract.

QUESTION 34. Pages C-20, H-2: The position is designated as Senior Research Advisor. On page H-1, the position is designated as Senior Research Agronomist. Please clarify.

ANSWER 34. The word Agronomist is an error – the position is Senior Research Advisor (changed through this modification).

QUESTION 35. Please explain what Title XII - Set Aside means.

ANSWER 35. Only Title XII universities may submit a proposal under this RFP.

QUESTION 36. Please indicate the degree of flexibility which will be acceptable regarding proposed Project staffing patterns and the total Level of Effort.

ANSWER 36. For long-term expatriates there is some degree of flexibility and for the locals there is complete flexibility.

QUESTION 37. Please indicate whether modifications will be allowed in the designation of the Chief of Party.

ANSWER 37. The chief of party can change over time. There is no requirement that the COP be the same individual throughout the life of the contract. However, the initial person proposed is expected to have signed an agreement to come to Ethiopia for at least two years.

QUESTION 38. Please provide us with the Ethiopia local compensation plan.

ANSWER 38. It will be posted on the web site where the Annexes have been posted.

QUESTION 39. With reference to page C-24 of the RFP, please clarify "collaborating unit directors".

ANSWER 39. Heads of collaborating organizations/institutions.

QUESTION 40. Please clarify "Activity Coordination" (page C-13 of RFP).

ANSWER 40. In support of the ANRS regional food security program, the contractor is expected to assist in coordinating and supporting future Title II CS activities in the region to consistency with and contribution to the RHPP SO.